





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/937,274	09/24/2001	Jaap Van Der Louw	99469 US	2129
75	90 01/15/2002			
William M Blackstone			EXAMINER	
Akzo Nobel 1300 Piccard Drive Suite 206 Rockville, MD 20850-4373			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
110011110, 1112	2000 1010		1616	
			DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No. Applicant(s)						
	09/937,274	VAN DER LOUW ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Sabiha Naim Qazi	1616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Peri d for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of the vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become a	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 S</u>	Sentember 2001						
	is action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-16 is/are pending in the	e application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13-16</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-11</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>13-16</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep	ted or b)⊡ objected to by	the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐	disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office action.						
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		•					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ⊠ Some * c) ☐ None of:	,						
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro- 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic							
Attachment(s)	· •						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice o	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/937,274

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 3-11, drawn to compounds and compositions, classified in class 552, subclass 575, 539, 575, 632; class 514, subclass 179, 180.

Group II, claim 13, drawn to kit, classified in class 514, subclass 178, 180.

Group III, claim(s) 14-16, drawn to method of use, classified in class 514, subclass 178, 180.

- 2. The inventions listed as Groups I to III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. Each does not contribute to special technical feature. Method of use claims are different from the compound claims and do not relate to single inventive step. It would be a burden on Examiner to search all the invention as instantly claimed properly.
- 3. During a telephone conversation with Attorney William M. Blackstone on 12/4/01, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1, and 3-11. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 13-16 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
- 4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventor ship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventor ship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

First Office Action on Merits

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-16 are pending.

Claims 1, and 3-11 are examined, 13-16 are withdrawn from consideration as non elected invention. No claim is allowed.

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Application/Control Number: 09/937,274

Art Unit: 1616

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3, 8 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AN-CA62:1704c, HCAOLD and AN CA61:4426h, CAOLD, abstract of BE 623844. See compound of registry number 95171-22-5 and 95366-80-6. See the abstract. The substituent at 7-position (in instant claims R2) contain propynyl and n- propanol, the same groups are instantly claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Graham Factual Inquiries (MPEP 2141, 2144.08)

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 1298974.

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01).

The reference teaches a generic group of compounds which embraces applicant's claimed compounds. See the entire document especially formula in lines 10 and 12, page 1; lines 15-32, page 2; lines 44-59, page 4 and examples 1-3. These compounds are taught to be useful for antihormonal activity.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue (MPEP 2141.02). Instant claims differ from the reference by reciting specific species and/or a more limited subgenus than the reference. For example prior art teaches alkyl group at 7-position of the steroid, instant invention is claiming C2-C3 alkyl and isopropyl group. Even though methyl group and two compounds having $7-\alpha$ -ethyl and $7-\alpha$ -propyl groups are disclaimed by the Applicants, instant invention is considered obvious because all the alkyl groups are taught by the prior art.

Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art (MPEP 2141.03).

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the

Art Unit: 1616

genus as a whole, i.e., antihormonal activity, especially anti-estrogenic activity (lines 44-59 on page 4).

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness (2144.04 and 2144.09). Motivation to select isopropyl, propyl or ethyl groups at 7-position is because alkyl group at 7-position is taught by the reference. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Telephone Inquiry Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha N. Qazi, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

1/11/02

Sabiha N. Qazi, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner, Art unit 1616

S. OPD